

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

4
5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

David Lucas Burge; et al.,
Plaintiffs,
vs.
Freelife International, Inc.,
Defendant.

“Inquiring whether the court has jurisdiction over this case.” *Belleville Catering Co. v. Champagne Catering Co.*, 374 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 2003). In this case, Plaintiffs cite no authority to give this Court jurisdiction. In fact, in the *Belleville* case, a state statute and a state rule of court, but not the federal court.

Because federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction, jurisdiction must plead sufficient facts for the court to have jurisdiction. *Guardian Life Ins. Co. of Am.*, 511 U.S. 378 (1994), 1116-17 (9th Cir. 2004).

Therefore,

///

///

///

0 Plaintiffs,
1 vs.
2
3 Freelife International, Inc.,
4 Defendant.

6 “Inquiring whether the court has ju
7 case.” *Belleville Catering Co. v. Champaign*
8 Cir. 2003). In this case, Plaintiffs cite no s
9 give this Court jurisdiction. In fact, in the “
10 a state statute and a state rule of court, but
11 Because federal courts are court
12 jurisdiction must plead sufficient facts for
13 *Guardian Life Ins. Co. of Am.*, 511 U.S. 37
14 1116-17 (9th Cir. 2004).

15 Therefore,

16 ///

17 ///

18 ///

6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

25
26
27
28


26
27
28

27
28

28

IT IS ORDERED that by July 2, 2009, Plaintiffs shall file an amended complaint properly alleging federal subject matter jurisdiction, or this case will be dismissed without prejudice for lack of federal subject matter jurisdiction.

DATED this 12th day of June, 2009.


James A. Teilborg
United States District Judge